

To: Opalski, Dan[Opalski.Dan@epa.gov]
Cc: Rueda, Helen[Rueda.Helen@epa.gov]; Cope, Ben[Cope.Ben@epa.gov]; Owens, Kim[Owens.Kim@epa.gov]
From: Croxton, Dave
Sent: Tue 6/4/2013 7:46:10 PM
Subject: Pend Oreille update

Dan,

At our meeting yesterday on the Pend Oreille, Ecology stood fast by their temperature TMDL and said they did not hear anything that made them think there was value in changing it. They stated clear frustration with this TMDL being their most resource-intensive TMDL and yet it having such minor temperature consequences. Also, Ecology criticized other methodology alternatives as also including potentially arbitrary assumptions. Absent some new information or argument that Ecology feels it did not consider, the message at this point appeared to be that Ecology was looking for EPA to take action one way or the other on the final TMDL.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative

Dave